

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 16 and 17 have been amended. Support for these claims are found, for example, at page 16, line 14 to page 19, line 16 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter is introduced.

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the Office Action in a telephonic interview on June 29, 2006. The Examiner's input is much appreciated.

I. Amended Claims

Base Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to delete the limitation "determining whether a predefined piece of data or keyword appears in URLs of the subject Web page or in URLs that refer to the subject Web page.

Dependent Claims 6, 7, 16 and 17 have been amended to add the limitations which have now been deleted from respective base Claims 1 and 10. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Claim 7 as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request that this amendment be entered.

No new matter has been introduced by way of this amendment.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-20

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 10-12 and 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,162) (hereinafter "Russell-Falla") in view of Chakrabarti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,436) (hereinafter "Chakrabarti").

As the Examiner agreed during the interview, base Claims 1 and 10 as now amended are not found to be obvious over Russell-Falla in view of Chakrabarti. Claims 2-3 and 6-9 depend from Claim 1. Claims 11, 12 and 15-18 depend from Claim 10. Thus, each of these claims are also not obvious from the cited prior art. As such, Applicants respectfully request the § 103(a) rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-9, 10-12 and 15-18 be withdrawn.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14

Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla in view of Chakrabarti in further view of Haug et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,964) (hereinafter “Haug”). Haug is directed to a probabilistic model for determining the meaning of sentences or phrases in medical reports. The Haug model extracts and encodes medical concepts using a Bayesian network.

Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 depend from base Claims 1 or 10. Therefore, Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 also include the element of the distinguishing series of tests having both binary and non-binary tests. As explained above, neither Russell-Falla nor Chakrabarti teach, suggest or otherwise make obvious the distinguishing series of tests having one or more tests involving syntax, grammar or page style of Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14. Furthermore, Haug does not cure this deficiency to make Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 obvious. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the § 103(a) rejection of Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _____
H. Joon Chung
Registration No. 52,748
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

7/17/06